DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 373 SO 025 004

AUTHOR Giesbrecht, Norman
TITLE A Quasi Meta-Analysis of the God Concept Literature from 1970 to 1994.
PUB DATE [94]
NOTE 57p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beliefs; Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Influences; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Ideology; Opinions; *Philosophy; *Religion; *Religion Studies; Religious Factors; Social Science Research; Values
IDENTIFIERS *God (Concept)

ABSTRACT

This literature review examines the "God concept," defined as the "cognitive or affective internal psychological representation of God." Most religions have a conception of God. In this review relevant literature focused on: (1) conceptual representations of God; (2) factors related to or predictive of these representations; and/or (3) development of God concept representations. Only literature concerned with specific factors or dimensions of God concept, or the development of internal representations of Deity, was included. The data are based on a review of English journal literature and ERIC database documents from 1970 to the end of 1994. A total of 52 relevant articles were identified, with four additional articles dated prior to 1970 due to the nature of the article. Each article was tabulated using the God Concept Article Evaluation Form included in Appendix A. Descriptive data, research design and level of research were captured on each article, and empirical studies were evaluated on their sample characteristics, methodology and results. A survey database program was used to analyze the data and frequency distributions were generated for each item evaluated. Cross-tabulations were used to explore relationships and trends. Empirical findings suggest that internal representations of self, parent(s) and God are related. High self-esteem, nurturant parenting and intrinsic religious commitment are often significantly related to positive God images. The God Concept Evaluation form is appended. Contains 59 references. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 387 373

A Quasi Meta-Analysis of the God Concept Literature from 1970 to 1994

Norman Giesbrecht

University of Calgary

50025004

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norman Giesbrecht

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Table of Contents

List of Tables iv

Introduction

Definition of God Concept 1

Literature Search 2

Article Analysis 2

Descriptive Information

Authorship

Authors 3

Number of authors 4

Gender 5

Publication

Journal 5

Type of journal 6

Year of publication 8

Summary 8

Research Design

Research Design 9

Correlational 10

Philosophical 11

Comparative 12

Survey 13

Case study 14

Historical / Review 15

Ethnographic 16

Experimental 16

Level of Research 17
Step 1 18
Step 2 18
Step 3 19
Step 4 20
Step 5 22
Step 6 23
Theoretical Orientation 23
Literature Review 24
Research Objectives and Hypotheses 25
Summary 26
Empirical Research
Sample Characteristics
Sample size 27
Gender 27
Religion 27
Age 27
Education 28
Race / ethnicity 28
Geographical location 28
Other demographic data 28
Sample selection 28
Summary 29

Methodology

God Concept measures 29

Descriptive statistics 32

Data analysis techniques 32

Independent variables 33

Research recommendations 35

Findings

God Concept factors 35

Gender differences 37

Age differences 37

Cultural differences 38

Cognitive development 38

Parental concept 38

Self-esteem 39

Religious commitment 39

Political and ideological views 40

Sexual abuse 40

Incarceration 40

Summary 41

Conclusion 42

References 43

Appendix A

God Concept Article Evaluation Form

List of Tables

Table 1 God Concept Articles by Number of Authors 4

Table 2 God Concept Articles by Journal 6

Table 3 God Concept Articles by Type of Journal 7

Table 4 God Concept Articles by Five-Year Period 8

Table 5 God Concept Articles by Research Design 10

Table 6 God Concept Articles by Level of Research 17

Table 7 Types of God Concept Measurement Instruments 30

Table 8 God Concept Measurement Instruments 32

Table 9 Data Analyis Techniques 33

Table 10 Independent Variables 34

Introduction

At the heart of most religions is a conception of God. An encounter with this God is understood to be a spiritually and psychologically transformative experience. In Canada, a nation-wide Catholic educational system and numerous private Christian, Jewish and other religious schools exist to help students understand and encounter God. Seminaries, churches and synagogues instruct adults in the theological attributes and characteristics of God. Counsellors working from a religious framework or therapists working with religious clients often grapple with clients' projected and distorted conceptions of God. Given the primacy of the God concept in religious education, instruction and therapy, a quasi meta-analysis of the literature would seem beneficial to religious educators and therapists.

Definition of God Concept

For the purposes of this review, God concept was defined as the cognitive or affective internal psychological representation of God. Relevant literature was considered to be that which focused on: conceptual representations of God, factors related to or predictive of these representations, and/or development of God concept representations. Only literature which concerned itself with specific factors or dimensions of God concept, or the development of internal representations of Deity, was included.

Literature Search

The data presented here are based on a review of English journal literature and ERIC documents from 1970 to the end of 1994. Articles were collected by means of (a) identifying all articles that the PsycLit, SocioFile, ERIC and Religion Indexes listed as referencing 'God', 'God concept' and/or 'God image' in the title, abstract or keywords; (b) examining article abstracts and/or contents; and (c) examining the reference lists of articles obtained by the previous two methods. A total of fifty-two relevant articles were identified. Four additional articles dated prior to 1970 were also included, because: (a) three of these articles represented the first published works of several widely-used God concept instruments: the Spilka, Armatus & Nussbaum Q-sort (Spilka, Armatus & Nussbaum, 1964), the Gorsuch Adjective Checklist (Gorsuch, 1968), and the Score-Dieu-Parent (Vergote, Tamayo, et al. 1969), and (b) the other article (Spiro & D'Anrade, 1958) provided an example of an ethnographic study.

Article Analysis

Each article was tabulated using the **God Concept Article Evaluation Form** in Appendix A. Descriptive data, research design and level of research were captured on each article, and empirical studies were evaluated on their sample characteristics, methodology and results. This data was entered into a survey database program, and frequency distributions were generated for each item evaluated. Cross-tabulations were used to explore relationships and trends.

Descriptive Information

Authorship

Authors. Of the fifty-two God concept articles, 38% (N=20) were the work of nine authors. This suggests there are a group of researchers spearheading research in this field. A brief summary of these nine authors' contributions confirms this:

Spilka, Armatus and Nussbaum (1964) factor-analyzed God concept descriptions, Spilka, Addison and Rosensohn (1975) explored the relationship between God, self and parental concept and Spilka and Reynolds (1975) the relationship between religion and prejudice. Gorsuch (1968) developed a God Concept Adjective Checklist that has been widely used, and Schaefer and Gorsuch (1991, 1992) are working on an empirically-based belief-motivation theory of religiousness. Tamayo et al. (1976, 1977) and Vergote et al. (1969, 1972) developed the Score-Dieu-Parent scale to measure paternal and maternal aspects of God and parental image, and spearheaded over a decade of research into cultural differences in God concept. This research culminated in a major contribution to the field: The Parental Figures and the Representation of God (Vergote & Tamayo, 1981). Nelson et al. (1973, 1985) explored the relationship between God concept, gender and culture, and Buri (1990) and Buri and Mueller (1987, 1993) explored the relationship between parenting style, self-esteem and God concept. Rizzuto (1974, 1991) introduced an object relations perspective that differentiated between a socioculturally-based cognitive God concept and an internalized

affective God image. Her publication of the seminal work The Birth of the Living God: A Psychoanalytic Study (Rizzuto, 1979) has served to stimulate further empirical studies of affective God representations (Lawrence, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1992).

Number of authors. The number of authors was identified, and the results are presented in the following table:

Table 1

God Concept Articles by Number of Authors

Articles	One	Two	Three	Four	Five+
Number	22	24	4	0	2
Percent	42%	46%	8%	0%	4%

Published research in this field appeared to be primarily an individual (42%) or two-person (46%) effort. Only two studies had four or more authors, and one of these (Bassett et al., 1990) included the names of numerous graduate assistants. The other (Vergote et al., 1969) was a pioneering study in what become a decade-long study of cross-cultural differences in God concept (Vergote & Tamayo, 1981). This research was based in Europe, and represents the only extended collaborative effort in the field. However, two senior American researchers, Spilka and Gorsuch, have also engaged in collaborative efforts with other authors. More of these mentoring and collaborative research relationships can only serve to strengthen research in this field.

Gender. The author's gender was determined based on the author's first name. Of forty-nine first authors whose gender could be determined, 84% (N=41) were male and 16% (N=8) were female; and of twenty-nine second authors, 76% (N=22) were male and 24% (N=7) were female. Of the eight research studies headed by women (i.e., female first author), 50% (N=4) were from 1990 to 1994, 63% (N=5) utilized a case study or philosophical design, and 63% (N=5) reflected a psychoanalytic theoretical orientation. A major contribution by Anne-Marie Rizzuto (1979) introduced the importance of the affective God concept into a field focused almost exclusively on cognitive schemata. Though the research is predominately by men, women are increasingly becoming involved, providing new perspectives and making significant contributions.

Publication

Journal. Table 2 lists the names of journals publishing God concept research. The primary publishers include: Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion (19%, N=10), the Review of Religious Research (10%; N=5), and the Journal of Psychology and Christianity (10%; N=5). Of the twenty-six publications in the past decade (i.e., 1985 to 1994), 42% were in the Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion (23%) and Journal of Psychology and Christianity (19%). These journals are well-established referred journals dedicated to exploring religious phenomenon from a scientific and psychological perspective. This suggests there is an established and reputable forum where God concept research can be communicated to and reviewed by other scholars.

Table 2

God Concept Articles by Journal

Journal	Number	%
Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion	10	19 %
Other journals (i.e., with only one study) [1]	9	17 %
Journal of Psychology and Christianity	5	10 %
Review of Religious Research	5	10 %
Journal of Psychology	4	8 %
Social Compass	4	8 %
ERIC document	3	6 %
Journal of Psychology and Theology	3	6 %
Pastoral Psychology	3	6 %
British Journal of Medical Psychology	2	4 %
Journal of Pastoral Care	2	4 %

[1] Other journals with a single God concept study include:
American Anthropologist
Character Potential
The Christian Century
Journal of Genetic Psychology
Journal of Individual Psychology
New Catholic World
New Directions for Child Development
Psychological Reports
Religious Education

Type of journal. Table 3 categorizes the God concept articles by the type of publications. Almost half of the articles (48%; N=25) were published in journals focusing on psychological issues within the field of religion. Nineteen

percent (N=10) were in psychological journals but only 14% (N=7) in pastoral care journals, 6% (N=3) in educational journals and 4% (N=2) in religious or theological journals. Though one might expect to find a majority of relevant articles in psychological-religious and psychological journals, it is surprising that so little material has been published in pastoral care, educational psychology and religious-theological journals. To some degree, this may be because very little step 5 and step 6 research has been done (see Level of Research for more details). It may also be that pastoral care workers and religious educators implicitly assume that a cognitively-based didactic pedagogy will result in the development of appropriate conceptions of Deity. The field might benefit from more research oriented to practioners such as pastoral care workers and religious educators.

Table 3

God Concept Articles by Type of Journal

Type of Journal	Number	%
Psychology of Religion	25	48 %
Psychology	10	19 %
Pastoral Care	7	14 %
Sociological	5	10 %
Educational (including ERIC documents)	3	6 %
Religious or Theological	2	4 %

Year of publication. The four pre-1970 articles were not included in the year of publication analysis. The remaining forty-eight articles were grouped into five-year periods, and their frequency distributions are outlined in Table 4. Published research showed a gradual increase over the twenty-five period, with 62.5% more articles published from 1990 to 1994 than in the comparable five-year period from 1970 to 1974. There was a significant drop in publications during the early 1980's, for which there is no readily apparent explanation.

Table 4

God Concept Articles by Five-Year Period

Articles	70-74	75-79	80-84	85-89	90-94
Number	8	10	4	12	14
Percent	17%	21%	8%	25%	29%

Summary

God concept research appears to be spearheaded by a small group of predominately male researchers working individually or in joint collaboration. There has been a slow but steady increase in research studies conducted since the early 1970's. The results are published in several psychology of religion journals, that provide an established and reputable forum for dialogue with similarly-minded scholars.

Research Design

All articles were classified according to their research design, level of research, and theoretical orientation. The articles' literature reviews were examined for comprehensiveness, and the presence (or absence) of research objectives and hypothesis were noted. These analyses are presented below:

Research design

Articles were classified into eight categories using the taxonomy described by Jaeger (1988). A comparative category was also included to describe correlational or survey studies that contrasted two purposefully selected samples. Table 5 lists the God concept articles by research design. The most common designs were correlational (N=19; 37%) and philosophical (N=11; 21%). However, since the comparative studies utilized a correlational analysis to compare results across two purposefully-selected populations, one could argue that correlational designs reflect half (N=26; 51%) of the fifty-two studies. This correlational research usually explored factors related to and predictive of God concept. However, these God concepts were also the product of correlational-based factor analysis research and lacked a theoretical rationale. There appears to be a self-propagating tendency to utilize correlational designs. Though correlational designs are easily-accessible and allow inter-study comparisons to be made, the use of other designs (i.e., particularly experimental) would enrich the research in this field.

Table 5

God Concept Articles by Research Design

Research Design	Number	Percentage
Correlational	19	37 %
Philosophical	11	21 %
Comparative	7	14 %
Case Study	6	12 %
Survey	6	12 %
Historical / Review	2	4 %
Ethnographic	1	2 %
Experimental	0	0 %

Note. Percentages do not add up to 100 % because of rounding.

Correlational. Correlational studies were defined as empirically-based studies that sought to identify component factors of God concept, or variables related to or predictive of God concept. Thirty-seven percent (N=19) of the articles could be classified as utilizing a correlational design. More than half (58%; N=11) were joint collaborations - all of which included one of the following three researchers: Spilka, Gorsuch or Buri. A psychoanalytic (47%; N=9) and/or cognitive consistency (37%; N=7) theoretical orientation were most common, but 26% (N=5) had no stated theoretical orientation. Almost three-quarters (74%; N=14) used a convenience sample, and

subjects were usually American (95%; N=18), undergraduate students (79%; N=14), Catholic (63%; N=12), and of unknown race and ethnicity (90%; N=17). Subjects usually completed an adjective checklist (42%; N=8) or semantic differential scale (37%; N=7) which, in almost half the studies, was a self-developed instrument (47%; N=9). These correlational studies usually explored the relationships between God concept and religious commitment or behaviour (42%; N=8), parental concept or parenting style (42%; N=8), and/or self-esteem (32%; N=6). The Findings section presents a detailed outline of these results.

Philosophical. Articles were defined as philosophical if they attempted to reconceptualize the field or utilized psychological, sociological or theological theoretical orientations as a basis for narrative explanations of God concept or God concept developmental processes. Twenty-one percent (N=11) of the articles had a philosophical design. All were individual efforts, predominately (82%; N=9) from the past ten years (i.e., 1985 to 1994). Two-thirds (64%; N=7) drew from psychoanalytic or object relations theory, and about one-quarter (27%; N=3) from a developmental perspective. Over half (55%; N=6) attempted to integrate a theological perspective. About a third (36%; N=4) were published in pastoral care journals. When compared with other categories, the philosophical articles were more likely to incorporate a theological perspective and direct their writing toward religious educators, therapists and workers.

Comparative. Comparative studies were defined as utilizing a purposeful selection of two or more distinct samples or populations. These studies were correlational in nature, but sought to compare or contrast results for two or more groups. Fourteen percent (N=7) of the studies could be classified as comparative designs. All of these were joint collaborations between two (71%; N=5) or more authors. Comparative studies were more likely than other studies to incorporate a sociological orientation (57%; N=4), though psychoanalytic (43%; N=3), cognitive consistency (29%; N=2) and developmental (29%; N=2) orientations were also popular. Almost three-quarters (71%; N=5) used conveniently-available samples of the populations they were interested in. Seventy-one percent (N=5) used American undergraduate students as a sample or as a comparison group. Single sample studies explored the dimensions of gender (Nelson, Cheek & Au, 1985; Tamayo & Dugas, 1977), cognitive style (Tamayo & Desjardins, 1976), developmental stage (Bassett et al., 1990) or educational field of study (Tamayo & Dugas, 1977). Two-sample studies compared sexually-abused versus non-abused children (Johnson & Eastburg, 1992) and incarcerated versus non-offending groups (Jolley & Taulbee, 1986). Because the designs involved group comparisons, researchers tended to include frequency distributions (57%; N=4) and used analysis of variance (57%; N=4) and/or Chi-square (57%; N=4) statistical analysis techniques.

Survey. Articles were defined as using a survey design if their primary purpose was to describe the characteristics of a large group of people. Survey designs were focused on present conditions and utilized samples that were representative of the populations to which the author wished to generalize. Twelve percent (N=6) of the studies were classified as utilizing a survey design. All were from the decade of the 1970's or 1980's. Most (83%; N=5) polled a population and two-thirds (67%; N=4) used random selection sampling techniques. Three of the six surveys were national (i.e., United States) in scope. Welch & Leege (1988) surveyed American Catholic parishioners God concepts and socio-political attitudes. Roof & Roof (1984) utilized twelve items on the General Social Survey to factor analyze American adults' God concepts. Potvin (1977) analyzed American adolescent God concepts using Gallup poll data. Sample sizes for the six surveys ranged from 254 to 2667, with a mean of 1064 and median of 794. Two-thirds of the articles did not include a theoretical orientation, and those that did drew on a sociological perspective. Half (50%; N=3) either neglected to or only cursorily reviewed past survey and other related research. Half explored God concept differences related to demographic factors such as age, gender, education, geographical location or religious affiliation, usually presenting the data in terms of frequency distributions. One-third (33%; N=2) explored the statistical significance of these differences using analysis of variance and/or chi-square techniques. Welch & Leege (1988) used

factor analysis to explore underlying patterns in Catholic parishioners' religious imagery, and Potvin (1977) used discriminant analysis to identify variables that discriminated between adolescents' concept of God as loving and/or punishing. Though the three national surveys are generalizeable to the American population, there are no recent follow-up surveys that enable one to identify trends. Since the data is limited to American subjects, Canadian generalizations and international comparisons are difficult. The inclusion of similar God concept items in the Canadian General Social Survey would be beneficial.

Case study. Case studies were defined as focusing on a small sample of individuals for the purpose of gaining insight rather than generalizing results. Twelve percent (N=6) of the articles utilized a case study design. This was the only category where female authors (N=3) outnumbered male authors (N=2) (i.e., one author's gender was unknown). On average, one case study was published each five-year period. Almost all (83%; N=5) drew on a psychoanalytic or object relations perspective, and focused on with the influence of psychic structure (67%; N=4), parental concept (50%; N=3) and/or self-concept and self-esteem (33%; N=2) on God concept. Two-thirds (N=4) used purposeful samples. Samples consisted of either American (N=4) or European (N=2) citizens, and two-thirds (N=4) of the studies used middle adults aged 30 to 49 years. Some sample were larger than expected, ranging from 2 to 180 subjects with a mean of 69 and median of 56. All studies utilized an interview approach,

with half (N=3) utilizing an in-depth clinical interview and two a projective technique. Most (83%; N=5) used qualitative data analysis. Three studies (50%) provided frequency distributions of data, and two used analysis of variance, Chi-square or a non-parametric technique to analyze results.

Historical / Review. Historical or review articles were defined as those that provided an overview of developments in the field or provided a comprehensive literature review of past research. Only two articles (4%) could be classified as historical or review. Beit-Hallahmi and Argyle (1975) provided a review or mini meta-analysis of six empirical God concept studies from 1957 to 1971. They explored the findings in light of psychoanalytic theory and concluded that the relationships between Deity and parental images supported the idea that parental projection influences God concept. Later studies (Buri, 1990; Buri & Mueller, 1987, 1993), however, suggest that self-esteem or self-schemata has a stronger relationship to God concept than parenting style. The other historical / review article (Vergote & Aubert, 1972) reviewed six intercultural studies and concluded that culturally-based paternal and maternal ideals were related to the structuring and nurturing qualities ascribed to God and that subjects' conceptions of God were much broader and all-encompassing than their parental images. There have been no reviews of the God concept literature since these two studies conducted in the early and mid 1970's.

Ethnographic. Ethnographic studies were defined as those which utilized naturalistic data or methodologies to explore the characteristics of ethnocultural groups. Only one article could be classified as ethnographic (Spiro & D'Anrade, 1958). This study used secondary anthropological data on twelve indigenous tribal groups. From a psychoanalytic and anthropological / sociocultural theoretical perspective, cultural perceptions of Deity were compared with parental and societal childrearing styles. The results suggested that benevolent God concepts were related to nurturant childrearing practices.

Experimental. Experimental designs included pre-experimental (pilot studies or single-group designs), quasi-experimental (beyond pre-experimental with comparison groups but no random selection) and experimental (control group and random selection). The literature search and article evaluations failed to uncover an experimental design. This result was somewhat surprising, since it was expected that religious educators and therapists would be interested in evaluating the efficacy and effectiveness of various instructional practices, interventions and/or therapeutic techniques in facilitating 'healthy' conceptions of God. Clearly, there is a need for research that explores these dynamics.

Level of Research

Articles were classified into categories of Basic research (Steps 1 thru 3) or Applied research (Steps 4 thru 6) using Hilgard's (1967) taxonomies as a guide. Table 6 lists the number and percentage of God concept articles at each level of research.

Table 6

God Concept Articles by Level of Research

Level of Research	Number	Percentage
Basic		
Step 1	3	6 %
Step 2	3	6 %
Step 3	20	39 %
Applied		
Step 4	18	33 %
Step 5	6	12 %
Step 6	2	4 %

Almost three-quarters of the research (73%; N=38) was at step 3 (39%; N=20) or step 4 (35%; N=18). This predominance of step 3 and step 4 was consistent for each five-year period since 1970. These step 3 and step 4 studies often explored the factors related to and predictive of God concept, and built on step 1 and step 2 studies conducted in the early 1970's. Unfortunately, most of these earlier step 1 and step 2 studies were exploratory

God concept factor analyses that lacked an explicit theoretical rationale. However, there are indications that researchers, such as Schaefer and Gorsuch (1991, 1992), are seeking to introduce more theoretical structure.

Step 1. Step 1 research was defined as exploratory research focused on theoretical constructs, such as exploratory factor analyses of God concept. Only three studies (Gorsuch, 1968; Spilka, Armatas & Nussbaum, 1964; Vercruysse, 1972) could be classified as step 1 research. All three studies were early explorations in the field, and none had explicit theoretical orientations or research hypotheses. Convenience samples consisting of (primarily) Catholic undergraduate students rated or sorted descriptions of God, which were then factor analyzed. The descriptive items used in the Spilka, Armatas and Nussbaum (1964) Q-sort formed the basis for Gorsuch's (1968) God Concept Adjective Checklist, which in turn, formed the basis for much subsequent exploration into God concept. Though these two studies were empirically and methodologically sound, the lack of a clear theoretical rationale for conceptualizing God concept has plagued much research in this field.

Step 2. Step 2 research was defined as construct and scale validations, and included confirmatory factor analyses of God concepts with diverse populations. Samples were often small and there was more concern with outcome results than with generalizeability. Three studies (6%) were classified as step 2 research. Nelson (1971) conducted an earlier study into the

relationship between subjects' perceptions of parents and God. Van Aerde (1972) explored Dutch adults' patterns of God concept and their relationship between to subject age, gender and occupation. Basset et al. (1990) developed a pictorial measure of God concept, similar to the Thematic Apperception Test, and explored its relationship to subjects' developmental stage.

Step 3. Step 3 research was defined as exploratory research of factors related to and/or predictive of God concept. Thirty-nine percent (N=20) studies were at step 3.

Of the twelve empirical studies, over half (58%; N=7) were conducted during the past decade. Almost all the step 3 empirical studies were conducted in the United States (92%; N=11) with convenience samples (67%; N=9) of undergraduate students (83%; N=10) and Catholics (50%; N=6). Most (83%; N=10) had explicit research hypotheses and used correlational designs (75%; N=9), with 50% (N=6) exploring the relationship between God concept and religious commitment and 25% (N=3) the relationship between God concept and self-esteem. One-quarter used Gorsuch's (1968) God Concept Adjective Checklist, one-quarter used Benson and Spilka's (1973) Loving and Controlling God scale, and one-third developed their own scales. Two of the four self-developed scales drew on Gorsuch's adjective list. Two-thirds (N=8) of the God concept measures had content validity, but only a quarter (N=3) had construct validity. Only one-third (N=4) reported internal reliabilities and none provided test-retest reliabilities. Only 58% (N=7) provided further research recommendations.

These results indicated both strengths and weaknesses in the step 3 research. The use of the Gorsuch (1968) and Benson and Spilka (1973) instruments reflects a move toward standardization and allows inter-study comparisons to be made, but most studies provided inadequate instrument reliability and validity information. Most step 3 studies were correlational investigations of the relationship between God concept and religious behaviour or self / parent concept. Research in this field could benefit from a broadening of the variables of interest and the inclusion of experimental research designs.

The eight (40%) non-empirical studies at step 3 were primarily philosophical (75%; N=6) designs with a psychoanalytic or object relations orientation (75%; N=6). These usually discussed the influence of parental concept, psychic structure or self-concept on the development of a God concept. More case study or ethnographic research would help 'flesh out' the ideas presented in these step 3 philosophical studies.

Step 4. Step 4 research was defined as purposeful comparisons between populations, surveys of specific sub-populations, therapeutic case studies, or studies designed to confirm variables' relationship to God concept. Samples were larger or purposeful in nature, and practical implications could be introduced. Thirty-five percent (N=18) of the studies were at step 4. Psychoanalytic (72%; N=13), cognitive consistency (28%; N=5) and sociological (22%; N=4) orientations were common. Almost three-quarters (72%; N=13) of the studies were empirical.

Sixty-nine percent (N=9) of the step 4 empirical studies had a correlational or comparative correlational design and included research hypotheses. These studies usually explored the relationship of God concept to self-esteem or self-concept (54%; N=7), parental concept (31%; N=4) or parenting style (31%; N=4). More than half (62%; N=8) utilized a self-developed scale, which was usually (75%; N=6) drew on Gorsuch's (1968) adjective checklist. Only one studies with a self-developed scale reported that a pilot study had been conducted.

Of the thirteen empirical step 4 studies, about half could be described as utilizing God concept measures with clear content validity (54%; N=7), internal reliability (54%; N=7) and construct validity (46%; N=6). None reported test-retest reliabilities, and three (23%) provided no validity or reliability information at all. Data were generally analyzed with correlational (77%; N=10) statistical techniques, followed in popularity by analysis of variance (46%; N=6), factor analysis (23%; N=3) and chi-square (23%; N=3) techniques. Only five studies (39%) reported God concept mean scores with only two (15%) also including standard deviations. Only 54% (N=7) provided further research recommendations.

All but one sample included both males and females. Most subjects were Americans (62%; N=8), and only one study used Canadians. Sample sizes ranged from eleven to 1121 subjects, with a mean of 298 and median of 213 subjects. Though convenience samples were popular (39%; N=5), the use of

purposeful samples (39%; N=5) and random selection (31%; N=4) were more prevalent than in other levels of research. Undergraduates remained the population of choice (54%; N=7), and Catholic subjects were also common (39%; N=5). A surprising 54% (N=7) did not identify subjects' religious affiliation.

These step 4 empirical studies had similar shortcomings to those at step 3. A psychoanalytic perspective that focused on the relationship between God concept and parental concept or parenting style still predominated much of the research. A large number of research studies used self-developed scales and paid insufficient attention to important considerations such as instrument validity and reliability. Sample groups continued to reflect a limited population of American Catholic undergraduates and restrict the generalizeability of findings.

Step 5. Step 5 research was defined as including cross-cultural survey comparisons, large population surveys, and suggestions for therapeutic or educational programs, techniques or interventions. Twelve percent (N=6) studies were at a step 5 level of research. A sociological (50%; N=3), psychoanalytic (33%; N=2) or developmental (33%; N=2) orientation were common. Three (50%) of these studies were empirical in nature. Vergote et al. (1969) compared the relationship between parental concept and God concept of American subjects with several other cultures. Nye and Carlson (1984) used clinical interviews with Catholic, Protestant and Jewish children to assess the cognitive level of God concept relative to Piaget's developmental stages. Welch and

Leege (1988) surveyed Catholic parishioners' sociopolitical attitudes. All three studies identified internal reliabilities two provided construct validity (66%; N=2) information.

Step 6. Step 6 research was defined as including national surveys, and program advocacy, recommendation or evaluation. Only two studies were at a step 6 level of research. Both of these (Nelson, Cheek, & Au, 1985; Roof & Roof, 1984) analyzed twelve God concept items included in the United States General Social Survey. Though these results are generalizeable to the population as a whole, no construct or content validity information was provided for these items. However, a factor analyses of these items (Nelson, Cheek, & Au, 1985) indicated they loaded with relative stability on three factors.

Theoretical Orientation.

The most common theoretical orientations were: psychoanalytic (33%; N=17), sociological (21%; N=11), cognitive consistency (14%; N=7), object relations (14%; N=7) and developmental (12%; N=6). These orientations can also be combined into 'schools'; i.e., the psychoanalytic, object relations, Adlerian and Jungian into a psychoanalytic school, and the cognitive consistency, attachment, social learning and symbolic interactionist into a cognitive theory school. If this is done, 52% (N=27) of the studies reflect a psychoanalytic perspective and 19% (N=10) a cognitive theory perspective. In some ways, the prevalence of a psychoanalytic perspective is not

surprising, since Freud was one of the few psychological theorists to explicitly address the dynamics of God conception. Many of these psychoanalytic studies attempt to support, test or refute Freudian hypotheses, or provide an alternative explanation (e.g., cognitive consistency theory). The prevalence of a psychoanalytic orientation may have limited the effectiveness of God concept research. Because of psychoanalytic theory's emphasis on the psychopathological aspects of God concept (a la Freud) and its' concern with the influence of parental concepts and parenting style on human development, much research seems to explore the factors related to God concept without a clear conceptualization of the dimensions of God concept.

Seventeen percent (N=9) of the studies provided no explicit theoretical rationale. These studies were correlational (56%: N=5) or survey (44%; N=4) designs that often employed a self-developed scale (78%: N=7) and usually had a missing or inadequate literature review (56%; N=5). Only 17% (N=9) included some theological rationale. Given the fact that God concept has strong theological connections, it is surprising that theological understandings of Divine nature and character have been only superficially been integrated into God concept research studies.

Literature Review

Articles were evaluated according to the quality and comprehensiveness of their literature review. Forty-two percent (N=22) had an adequate literature review and 31% (N=16) could be

described as providing a comprehensive review. However, 21% (N=11) of the articles provided an inadequate review of previous research and relevant theory and 6% (N=3) could be described as not providing even a 'bare minimum' of discussion on theory and related research. Though the greatest number were in the early 1970's, there were an average of two articles during every five-year period with a missing or inadequate review of previous research. The fourteen articles with an inadequate or missing literature review tended to be at a Step 3 level of research (50%; N=7) and over one-third (36%; N=5) lacked a clear theoretical orientation. These results suggest some God concept studies are conducted without a proper review of past research, and may attempt to explore predictor variables of God conception (Step 3 level of research) without an understanding of previous findings and/or a clear theoretical orientation and rationale.

Research Objective and Hypotheses

All the articles identified a research objective, but only 56% (N=29) included specific research hypotheses. Fifteen (47%) of the thirty-six empirical studies did not state hypotheses, but these were mostly (60%; N=9) from the decade of the 1970's or earlier. Of these fifteen studies, seven (47%) were basic research and so could possibly justify the need for only a research objective or question. However, the remaining eight studies (53%) were applied research and so should be expected to state research hypotheses. Most of the empirical studies without research hypotheses (N=13; 87%) used a correlational, survey or

comparative-correlational design. Forty percent (N=6) had no explicit theoretical orientation, one-third (N=5) had an inadequate literature review, 47% (N=7) used a self-developed scale and 47% (N=7) provided no further research recommendations. These results suggest that some of the work in this field (especially in the 1970s) consisted of ad-hoc undisciplined empirical research that was inadequately grounded in theory and provided a minimum of useful information.

Summary

Correlational designs and research conducted at step 3 and step 4 predominated the research. Most studies reflected a psychoanalytic or object relations perspective, and few explicitly integrated theological concerns. A theoretical basis for conceptualizing the God concept dimensions, greater diversity in theoretical perspectives, and utilization of a broader ranger of research designs and methodologies (e.g., experimental, longitudinal) would serve to enrich research in the field.

Empirical Research

Thirty-six (69%) of the fifty-two studies were empirical in nature. These empirical studies were evaluated in terms of their sample characteristics, methodology and findings.

Sample Characteristics

Sample size. Sample sizes ranged from eleven to 2,667 subjects. Samples had a median of 200 subjects and a mean of 421 subjects (S.D. = 548).

Gender. Eighty-six percents (N=31) of the empirical studies used samples consisting of both males and females. Only three studies (8%) used exclusively female subjects and only two (6%) used exclusively male subjects.

Religion. Most research (56%; N=20) focused on Catholic subjects. However, 28% (N=10) of the studies failed to identify the religious affiliation of their subjects. Since one would expect religious orientation or theology to be an important influence of God concept, it is surprising that so many studies failed to identify subjects' religious orientation.

Age. Forty-two percent (N=15) of the studies failed to identify the mean age or the age range of their subjects. To some degree, this may be attributable to the fact that convenience samples of undergraduate students were used and researchers may have assumed a certain associated age range. However, the increasing number of adults currently returning to school in later life may invalidate this assumption.

Education. A majority of the studies (69%; N=25) used convenience samples of undergraduate students. Such samples have markedly different characteristics from the general population, and their 'test-wiseness' may influence their responses.

Race / ethnicity. Sixty-nine percent (N=25) of the studies failed to identify the race or ethnicity of their subjects. Vergote and Tamayo's (1981) summary of a decade of research using the Score-Dieu-Parent scale showed distinct cultural differences in the maternal and paternal qualities subjects ascribed to Deity. As such, it is surprising that so few research studies have been sensitive to the influence of sociocultural variables on God concept responses.

Geographical location. Seventy-eight percent (N=28) of the samples were conducted with American subjects. Fourteen percent (N=5) were from Europe and only one study used Canadian subjects. Two studies failed to identify the national identity of subjects.

Other demographic data. Twenty-eight percent (N=10) of the studies also provided information on subjects' religious denomination, but only 11% (N=4) identified their marital status and only 8% (N=3) their socioeconomic status.

Sample selection. Over half (53%; N=19) of the empirical studies used convenience samples (36%; N=13) or a subset of a convenience sample (17%; N=6) based on some pre-established criteria (e.g., level of religious commitment). One-quarter (25%; N=9) used purposeful samples and 22% (N=8) used random selection. Sample selection techniques were related to the

research design, with convenience samples most often used (74%; N=14) in correlational designs, purposeful selection more common (66%; N=6) in case study, comparative and ethnographic designs, and random selection used (50%; N=4) in survey designs.

Summary. Most empirical God concept research is conducted with convenience samples of American, Catholic and undergraduate subjects. Very few studies identify subjects' socioeconomic status, age range, marital status and race / ethnicity. These sample limitations and demographic inadequacies limit the generalizeability of study outcomes.

Methodology

God Concept measures. Since God concept is, by definition, a primary variable in God concept research, both the type of measure and the specific instrument used to measure God concept were evaluated. The types of instruments used to measure God concept are outlined in Table 7. Sixty-nine percent (N=25) of the empirical studies asked subjects to rate descriptions of Deity using an adjective checklist, semantic differential scale or Q-sort technique. These three types of measures were particularly common in correlational (89%; N=17) and comparative (71%; N=5) studies. Case studies all utilized interviews, and surveys tended (67%; N=4) to use questionnaires or Likert scales.

Table 7

Types of God Concept Measurement Instruments

Type of instrument	Number	Percentage
Adjective checklist	12	33 %
Semantic differential scale	8	22 %
Q-sort	5	14 %
Likert scale	4	11 %
Interview	3	8 %
Projective technique	3	8 %
Questionnaire	3	8 %
Secondary data sources	3	8 %

Empirical studies were examined for evidence of a common set of scales or standardized instruments for measuring God concept. These God concept measurement instruments are listed in Table 8. Almost half the empirical studies (47%; N=17) used a self-developed scale, with 41% (N=7) drawing on Gorsuch's (1968) list of adjectives. In total, 42% (N=15) of the empirical studies used all or some of Gorsuch's (1968) God Concept Adjective Checklist. Benson and Spilka's (1973) Loving and Controlling God semantic differential scale and Spilka, Armatus and Nussbaum's (1964) Q-sort were also commonly used. There is a strong relationship between all three instruments, for Gorsuch (1968) drew from Spilka, Armatus and Nussbaum's (1964) list of adjective

descriptions, and Benson and Spilka's (1973) scale reflects elements of Gorsuch's (1968) adjectives. Despite the fact that these three measures have a semblance of being 'standardized instruments', there are some critical deficiencies. None have an strong underlying theoretical rationale, and thus lack construct validity. However, both the Gorsuch (1968) and the Spilka, Armatus and Nussbaum (1964) adjective lists used pilot studies and factor analysis to confirm their content validity. Benson and Spilka (1973) report the Loving and Controlling God scales have scale homogeneity values of .72 and .60, respectively, and Spilka, Armatus and Nussbaum's (1964) Q-sort factors have Kuder-Richardson reliabilities ranging from .51 to .77. No test-retest reliabilities have been reported for any of these scales. These validity and reliability inadequacies raise questions about these scales' research efficacy, and highlight the need for better instruments or more validity and reliability information.

The deficiencies of the self-developed scales (used in 47% of the empirical studies) are even more glaring. Only 41% (N=7) of these studies report a pilot study was conducted. Fifty-nine percent (N=10) provide information on content validity, 47% (N=8) identify internal reliabilities, 18% (N=3) supply construct validity information, and none provide test-retest reliabilities. Almost one-quarter (24%; N=4) provide no reliability or validity information at all. These results present a clear and graphic picture of the need for reliable and valid measurement instruments in the field of God concept research.

Table 8

God Concept Measurement Instruments

Measurement instrument	Number	Percentage
Self-developed scale	17	47 %
Loving and Controlling God scale	5	14 %
God Concept Adjective Checklist	4	11 %
Score-Dieu-Parent	4	11 %
Spilka & Armatus Q-sort	3	8 %
Clinical interview	3	8 %
General Social Survey	2	6 %
Ethnographic notes	1	3 %

Descriptive statistics. Only 36% (N=13) of the empirical studies reported God concept mean scores, with only 11% (N=4) reporting both the mean and standard deviation.

Data analysis techniques. Statistical data analysis techniques used in the empirical studies are listed in Table 9. Item correlations were the preferred analysis technique. This is not surprising, since 53% (N=19) of the empirical studies were correlational designs and many of the comparative designs could be described as comparative-correlational. Research design and data analysis technique were related, with correlational designs using correlation, regression and factor analysis; comparative

studies using frequency distributions, analysis of variance, chi-square and correlation; survey designs using frequency distributions, analysis of variance and chi-square; and case studies, qualitative analysis and frequency distribution.

Table 9

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis technique	Number	Percentage
Correlation	21	58 %
Analysis of variance (i.e., ANOVA)	12	33 %
Frequency distribution	12	33 %
Factor analysis	10	28 %
Chi-square	9	25 %
Regression	7	19 %
Qualitative	4	11 %
T-test	3	8 %
Discriminant analysis	2	6 %
Other non-parametric test	2	6 %

Independent variables. Table 10 identifies the independent variables that appeared in more than one empirical God concept studies. Variables mentioned in only one study include: parental attachment, anxiety, coping style, parental education, prejudice, cognitive style, political ideology, powerlessness, faith in people, self concept, culture and incarceration.

Table 10

Independent Variables

Independent variable	Number	Percentage
Self-esteem	9	25 %
Demographics (e.g., gender, age)	8	22 %
Parental concept	8	22 %
Religious commitment	6	17 %
Parenting style	5	14 %
Religious behaviour	4	11 %
Education (field of study)	3	8 %
Parental preference	3	8 %
Religious belief / attitude	3	8 %
Parental religious practice	2	6 %
Piagetian developmental stage	2	6 %
Psychic structure	2	6 %
Religious instruction	2	6 %
Sexual abuse	2	6 %
Locus of control	2	6 %

Despite the number of independent variables, several common themes emerge: parental characteristics, religious belief and behaviour, and self-esteem. Cross-tabulations showed that about one-third (39%; N=14) of the studies focused on parental characteristics (i.e., parental concept, preference, religious

practice or parenting style), a third (33%; N=12) on religious belief or behaviour (i.e., religious behaviour, commitment, belief / attitude or instruction) and a quarter (25%; N=9) on self-esteem or self-concept. Other than the catch-all demographic category, most of the other independent variables appear in only one or two studies. These results suggest that the empirical research in this field has had a very narrow focus, and that broader exploration is overdue.

Research recommendations. Forty-six percent (N=24) of the fifty-two studies provided recommendations for further research. The number was only slightly higher among empirical studies, with twenty of thirty-six (56%) empirical studies providing further research recommendations.

Findings

God Concept factors. Numerous studies have sought to identify the factors or dimensions of God concept, generally through factor analysis. Spilka, Armatus and Nussbaum (1964) found Catholic female undergraduates' Q-sorted responses of 64 adjectives produced factors they described as: stern father, omni-concept of God, impersonal God, kindly father, and supreme ruler. Gorsuch (1968) drew from Spilka et al.'s (1964) list, and a factor analysis of undergraduates' adjective ratings produced seven primary factors: Kindliness, Wrathfulness, Deisticness, Omni-ness, Evaluation, Irrelevancy, Eternality, and Potently Passive. These primary factors loaded into two second-order

factors, Benevolent Deity and Companionable, and one-third order factor, Traditional Christian. A 1992 study by Schaefer and Gorsuch with the same adjectives produced the following factors: Benevolent, Wrathful, Omni, Guiding, False, Stable, Deistic, Worthless, Powerful, Condemning and Caring.

A factor-analysis by Vercruysse (1972) found adults' perceptions of God included the following dimensions: personal, providential God, impersonal dynamic presence, ultimate explanation, and a bipolar factor related to God as a vague reality, the basis and goal of human commitment, and personally present. Among high school students, Vercruysse found the following factors: basis / guarantee / goal of human commitment with uncertain personal connotations, almighty judge who requires human obedience, vague reality, ultimate explanation, providential and helping God, and guiding force in history and evolution. Nelson, Waldron and Stewart (1973) found two God concept factors in Southern American undergraduate subjects response: an Old Testament view of God as avenging and wrathful and a New Testament view of God as merciful, kind and faithful.

Tamayo and Desjardins (1976) factor-analyzed Score-Dieu-Parent responses and found three God concept factors: Availability (tenderness, self-giving love and availability), and two authority factors: G1 (decision-making, order, firmness, action and initiative) and G2 (authority, rule, judge). Divine authority was seen as more normatively-oriented while parental authority focused on discipline, command and decision-making.

Nelson, Cheek and Au (1985) factor analyzed data for twelve God concept items in the General Social Survey, and found three God concept factors: Healer (i.e., creator, healer, friend and father), King (i.e., king, judge, master and liberator), and Relational (spouse, mother and lover). Roof and Roof (1984) also analyzed these General Social Survey items, and found Christians preferred the image of God as Healer, Jewish subjects saw God as Judge, and those with no church affiliation viewed God as Friend.

Welch and Leege (1988) factor-analyzed results from a national survey of Catholic parishioners and identified four God concept factors: Father (i.e., creator, father, friend, protector, redeemer), Companion (i.e., aware of everything I think, clearly knowable, close, my constant companion), Saviour (i.e., dependable, faithful, forgiving) and Judge (i.e., judge, judgemental, strict, master).

Gender differences. Hammersla, Andrews-Qualls and Frease (1986) found female subjects saw God as less Vindictive, less Irrelevant, and more Majestic than male subjects. Nelson, Cheek and Au (1985) found females more likely to see God as Healer (creator, healer, friend and father) than males. Potvin (1977) found adolescent females more likely to see God as personal, Loving and Not Punishing than adolescent males.

Age differences. Van Aerde (1972) reported that age, occupation and gender influenced subjects' God images. Hutsebaut (1972) found that as Dutch youths approached mid-adolescence, they looked to God for a source of stable relationship and their

God concepts emphasized relational qualities (e.g., father, friend, helper, benefactor). Older groups replaced father and creator images with expressions such as 'meaning of life'.

Cultural differences. Tamayo and Desjardins (1976), Tamayo and Dugas (1977), and Vergote and Aubert (1969) found subjects' God concepts varied across cultures. Vergote and Tamayo (1981) reported that a decade of research consistently found cultural differences in God concept, and concluded that culture provided the raw material from which parental and God images were formed.

Cognitive development. Basset et al. (1990) found subjects' selection of pictorial God images was related to their cognitive developmental stage ($F=14.5$, $p<.001$). Preoperational subjects preferred stereotypical Biblical storybook images (e.g., bearded, robed man with upraised hand preaching); concrete operational subjects preferred concrete pictures with some symbolism (e.g., man walking out of book); and formal operational subjects selected symbolic and abstract images. Nye and Carlson (1984) found children's conceptualization of God was related to Piagetian developmental stage.

Parental concept. Kirkpatrick and Shaver (1990) found a secure maternal attachment was significantly and positively related to a Loving God concept. Nelson (1971) found that correlations between subjects' God and parent concepts were significantly higher for the preferred parent. Birky and Ball (1988) found that subject' mother-father composite parental concept was significantly related to God concept. They concluded

that God concept was a product of composite object representations rather than the product of parental projection. Justice and Lambert (1986) found a significant relationship between the language subjects used to describe their parents and the language they used to describe God.

Self-esteem. Benson and Spilka (1973) found self-esteem positively and significantly related to loving God images and negatively related to rejecting-impersonal-controlling God images. Spilka, Addison and Rosensohn (1975) correlated parental concept, self concept and Loving and Controlling God images, and analyzed the results in light of psychoanalytic (i.e., Freudian), Adlerian, cognitive consistency and social learning theory. They concluded that the self-esteem (i.e., cognitive consistency) explanation was most strongly supported. In a series of three studies, Buri (1993) and Buri and Mueller (1987, 1990) found that self-esteem was significantly related to subjects' perceptions of God, and that self-esteem was a much stronger predictor of God concept than parenting style or parental nurturance. Potvin (1977) found that adolescent self-esteem was unrelated to God concept, and that greater parental control discriminated between subjects' perception of God as Loving and Punishing versus Loving and Not-Punishing.

Religious commitment. Schaefer and Gorsuch (1992) found church attendance and Intrinsic religious commitment significantly and positively related to perceptions of God as Benevolent, Omni, Guiding, Stable, Powerful, Caring, not Deistic

and not False. Hammersla, Andrews-Qualls and Frease (1986) found religious commitment positively related to a view of God as Benevolent, Creative, Majestic, Potent, Sensual and Valuable; and negatively related to a perception of God as Irrelevant and Distant. Spilka and Mullin (1975) found Intrinsic religious commitment significantly related to the God concept Traditional Christian, Kindliness and Deisticness and Extrinsic religious commitment significantly related to a view of God as Wrathful.

Political and ideological views. Welch and Leege (1988) found a concept of God as Judge was related to a conservative political ideology and a supportive stance on capital punishment, defense spending, busing and school prayers. Nelson, Waldron and Stewart (1973) found an Old Testament view of God was significantly related to sectarianism and suggested that this view was embedded in Southern culture. Spilka and Reynolds (1964) found prejudice was related to subjects' view of God as not concerned, kind, considerate or personally interested but rather unreal, impersonal, abstract, distant and inaccessible.

Sexual abuse. Johnson and Eastburg (1992) compared sexually abused and non-abused children and found significant differences in parental and self concept, but not God concept.

Incarceration. Jolley and Taulbee (1986) compared prisoners and normal God concepts. They found significant relationships between dimensions of self-concept and Loving God concepts, but insignificant relationships with Controlling God scores.

Summary. Most exploratory studies into the dimensions of God concept conducted factor analyses of adjective ratings. Though numerous primary factors were identified, most of the positive primary factors tended to load on a broad second or third-order factor. It was also common for a global bipolar positive-negative dimension to emerge. A theoretical rationale for God concept dimensions was noticeably absent. There were some indications that gender, age, culture and developmental stage are related to subjects' conception of God. Though there are indications that positive parental qualities are also attributed to God, it is unclear whether these are projected from parent to God or whether these simply reflect a human propensity to describe positive or idealized relationships using similar language. Positive self-regard tends to be significantly related to positive God images, and the relationship between self-esteem and God concept is usually stronger than between parental concept and God concept. It appears that self, parental and God representations are related. As might be expected, an authentic or Intrinsic religious commitment is usually related to positive God images. There are also some indications that conservative political ideology may be related to conservative (i.e., law and order) perceptions of God.

Conclusion.

The study of cognitive and affective internal God concept representations and their development has important implications for religious educators and therapists. A literature search uncovered fifty-two God concept journal articles published from 1970 to 1994, and there are indications of a gradual increase in God concept research over this twenty-five year span. A number of referred psychology of religion journals serve as a forum for publication and scholarly discussion. Most research is rooted in a psychoanalytic or cognitive consistency perspective. Correlational designs and step 3 and step 4 research predominate the field, and typically explore the relationship of God concept to parental concept or parenting style, self-esteem, and religious commitment. Empirical findings suggest that internal representations of self, parent(s) and God are related. High self-esteem, nurturant parenting and Intrinsic religious commitment are often significantly related to positive God images. Convenience samples consisting of American, Catholic and undergraduate subjects of unknown socioeconomic status and ethnicity are common, and limit the generalizeability of results. Three recommendations for improving the quality of research are suggested: (a) a theoretical rationale for conceptualizing the dimensions of God concept, (b) development of standardized God concept measures with strong validities and reliabilities, and (c) the incorporation of experimental research designs.

References

Acklin, T. (1990). The imaginative interplay of the self image and the image of God. New Catholic World, 269-272.

Ashbrook, J. B. (1989). Ways of knowing God: Gender and the brain. The Christian Century, 106(1), 14-15.

Bassett, R. L., Miller, S., Anstey, K., Crafts, K., Harmon, J., Lee, Y., Parks, J., Robinson, M., Smid, H., Sterner, W., Stevens, C., Wheeler, B., & Stevenson, D. H. (1990). Picturing God: A nonverbal measure of God concept for conservative Protestants. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 9(2), 73-81.

Beit-Hallahmi, B., & Argyle, M. (1975). God as a father -projection: the theory and the evidence. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 48, 71-75.

Benson, P.L., & Spilka, B. (1973). God image as a function of self -esteem and locus of control. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12(3), 297-310.

Birky, I.T., & Ball, S. (1988). Parental trait influence on God as an object representation. The Journal of Psychology, 122(2), 133-137.

Buri, J. R. (1990). Psychoanalytic bases for one's image of God: Fact or artifact. ERIC Document.

Buri, J.R., & Mueller, R.A. (1987). Conceptions of parents, conceptions of self, and conceptions of God. ERIC Document ED 289 131.

Buri, J. R. & Mueller, R.A. (1993). Psychoanalytic theory and loving God concepts: Parent referencing versus self -referencing. The Journal of Psychology, 127(1), 17-27.

Day, L. G. (1975). The development of the God concept: A symbolic interation approach. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 3, 172-178.

Foster, R. A., & Keating, J. P. (1992). Research note measuring androcentrism in the Western God-concept. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 31(3), 366-375.

Gaultiere, W. J. (1989). A Biblical perspective on therapeutic treatment of client anger at God. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 8(3), 38-46.

Gorsuch, R. L. (1968). The conceptualization of God as seen in adjective ratings. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 7(1), 56-64.

Halligan, F. R., & Shea, J. J. (1991). Sacred images in dreamwork: The journey into self as journey into God. Pastoral Psychology, 40(1), 29-37.

Hammersla, J. F., Andrews-Qualls, L. C., & Frease, L. G. (1986). God concepts and religious commitment among Christian university students. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 25(4), 424-435.

Heinrichs, D. J. (1982). Our Father which art in heaven: Parataxic distortions in the image of God. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 10(2), 120-129.

Hilgard, E. R. (1967). A perspective on the relationship between learning theory and educational practices. In E. R. Hilgard (Ed.), Theories of learning and instruction (pp. 402-415). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hutsebaut, D. (1972). The representation of God: two complementary approaches. Social Compass, XIX, 389-406.

Jaeger, R. M. (1988). Complementary methods: For Research in Education. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Johnson, W. B., & Eastburg, M. C. (1992). God, parent and self concepts in abused and nonabused children. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 11(3), 235-243.

Jolley, J., & Taulbee, S. (1986). Assessing perceptions of self and God: Comparison of prisoners and normals. Psychological Reports, 59, 1139-1146.

Justice, W. G., & Lambert, W. (1986). A comparative study of the language people use to describe the personalities of God and their earthly parents. The Journal of Pastoral Care, XXXX(2), 166-172.

Kirkpatrick L. A., & Shaver, P. R. (1990). Attachment theory and religion: Childhood attachments, religious beliefs, and conversion. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 29(3), 315-334.

Knight, G. D., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1981). Religious orientation and the concepts of God held by university students. Research Report #7-81, Counseling Center, University of Maryland. ERIC Document ED 220 757.

Lawrence, R. T. (1987). God image and self image: The need for a psychometric instrument. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Louisville, Kentucky.

Lawrence, R. T. (1989). Two cases: A report of a pre-clinical trial of the God image inventory for pastoral counseling use. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion.

Lawrence, R. T. (1991). The God image inventory: A psychometric instrument to measure the image of God. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Pittsburgh, PA.

Lawrence, R. T. (1992). Gender differences on the God image scales. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, Washington, D.C.

McDargh, J. (1986). God, mother and me: An object relational perspective on religious material. Pastoral Psychology, 34(4), 251-263.

Neff, T. (1977). Image of God and psychic structure. Lumen Vitae, 32(4), 399-422.

Nelson, M. O. (1971). The concept of God and feelings toward parents. Journal of Individual Psychology, 27, 46-49.

Nelson, H. M., Cheek, N. H., & Au, P. (1985). Gender differences in images of God. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24(4), 396-402.

Nelson, H. M., Waldron, T. W., & Stewart, K. (1973). Image of God and religious ideology and involvement: A partial test of Hill's southern culture-religion thesis. Review of Religious Research, 15(1), 37-44.

Nye, W. C., & Carlson, J. S. (1984). The development of the concept of God in children. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 145(1), 137-142.

Phillips, R. A. (1992). Erickson's life cycle theory and images of God. Pastoral Psychology, 40(3), 167-177.

Potvin, R. H. (1977). Adolescent God images. Review of Religious Research, 19(1), 43-53.

Rizzuto, A. (1974). Object relations and the formation of the image of God. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 47, 83-99.

Rizzuto, A. (1979). The Birth of the Living God: A Psychoanalytic Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rizzuto, A. (1991). Religious development: A psychoanalytic point of view. New Directions for Child Development, 52, 47-60.

Roof W. C., & Roof, J. L. (1984). Review of the polls: Images of God among Americans. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 23(2), 201-205.

Schaefer, C. A., & Gorsuch, R. (1991). Psychological adjustment and religiousness: The multivariate belief-motivation theory of religiousness. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30(4), 448-461.

Schaefer, C. A., & Gorsuch, R. (1992). Dimensionality of religion: Belief and motivation as predictors of behaviour. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 11(3), 244-254.

Spilka, B., Addison, J., & Rosensohn, M. (1975). Parents, self and God: A test of competing theories of individual-religion relationships. Review of Religious Research, 16(3), 154-165.

Spilka, B., Armatas, P. & Nussbaum, J. (1964). The concept of God: A factor-analytic approach. Review of Religious Research, 6, 28-36.

Spilka, B. & Reynolds, J. F. (1975). Religion and prejudice: A factor-analytic study. The Review of Religious Research, 6, 163-168.

Spiro, M. E., & D'Anrade, R. G. (1958). A cross-cultural study of some supernatural beliefs. American Anthropologist, 60, 456-466.

Stucky-Abbott, L. (1993). The impact of male God imagery on female identity meaning. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 47(3), 240-251.

Tamayo, A., & Desjardins, L. (1976). Belief systems and conceptual images of parents and God. The Journal of Psychology, 92, 131-140.

Tamayo, A., & Dugas, A. (1977). Conceptual representation of mother, father and God according to sex and field of study. The Journal of Psychology, 97, 79-84.

Underwood, R. L. (1986). The presence and absence of God in object relational and theological persepectives. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 14(4), 298-305.

Van Aerde, M. (1972). The attitude of adults towards God. Social Compass, XIX, 407-413.

Vannesse, A. (1977). Religious language and relation to the mother. Lumen Vitae, 32(4), 423-433.

Vercruysse, G. (1972). The meaning of God: A factoranalytic study. Social Compass, XIX, 347-364.

Vergote, A., & Aubert, C. (1972). Parental images and representations of God. Social Compass, XIX, 431-444.

Vergote, A., & Tamayo, A. (1981). The Parental Figures and the Representation of God: A Psychological and Cross-Cultural Study. The Hague, Paris: Mouton Publishers.

Vergote, A., Tamayo, A., Pasquali, L., Bonami, M., Pattyn, M., & Custers, A. (1969). Concept of God and parental images. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 8, 79-87.

Welch, M. R., & Leege, D. C. (1988). Religious predictors of Catholic parishioners' sociopolitical attitudes: Devotional style, closeness to God, imagery, and agentic/communal religious identity. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 27(4), 536-552.

White, F. J. (19xx). Earthly father/Heavenly Father. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 4(2), 76-82.

Williams, R. (1990). God-concept socialization: Some explanations from Piaget. Religious Education, 85(2), 311-315.

Appendix A

God Concept Article Evaluation Form

God Concept Article Evaluation Form

Descriptive information

Article title _____

_____

First author (name) .....

First author (gender) ..... ❑ Male ❑ Female ❑ Unknown

Second author (name) .....

Second author (gender) ..... ❑ Male ❑ Female ❑ Unknown

Number of authors ..... ❑ 1 ❑ 2 ❑ 3 ❑ 4 ❑ 5+

Journal

❑ Lumen Vitae
❑ Pastoral Psychology
❑ Review of Religious Research
❑ Social Compass
❑ Other: _____
❑ Eric document
❑ J. of Pastoral Care
❑ J. of Psychology
❑ J. of Psych & Christianity
❑ J. of Psych & Theology
❑ J. S. S. Religion
❑ Br. J. of Medical Psych

Type of Journal

❑ Psychology
❑ Psychology and Religion
❑ Religion/Theology
❑ Pastoral Care
❑ Sociology
❑ Educational Psychology

Publication year ..... ❑ '70-74 ❑ '75-79 ❑ '80-84 ❑ '85-89 ❑ '90-94

Research Design

Research design

❑ Correlational
❑ Historical/Review
❑ Philosophical
❑ Ethnographic
❑ Case study
❑ Survey
❑ Comparative
❑ Experimental

Level of Research (Basic vs Applied) ..... ❑ 1 ❑ 2 ❑ 3 ❑ 4 ❑ 5 ❑ 6

Theoretical orientation

❑ None / unclear
❑ Adlerian
❑ Attachment theory
❑ Biological/neurological
❑ Cognitive consistency
❑ Developmental (Piaget)
❑ Emperical
❑ Feminist
❑ Jungian
❑ Object relations
❑ Psychoanalytic
❑ Social Learning
❑ Sociological
❑ Symbolic interactionist
❑ Theological

Literature review ..... ❑ Missing ❑ Inadequate ❑ Adequate ❑ Comprehensive

Statement of hypotheses ..... ❑ Research objective ❑ Research hypothesis

Emperical Research

Sample Characteristics

Sample size ..... ☐

Gender ..... ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Both

Religion

- ☐ Atheist
- ☐ Catholic
- ☐ Christian
- ☐ Conservative Evangelical
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Protestant
- ☐ Unknown
- ☐ Other: _____

Age group

- ☐ Preschool
- ☐ Elementary (6-11)
- ☐ Pre-Adolescent (12-13)
- ☐ Adolescent (14-18)
- ☐ Young adult (19-29)
- ☐ Middle adult (30-49)
- ☐ Older adult (50-65)
- ☐ Retired (65+)
- ☐ Unknown

Education

- ☐ Preschool
- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Junior High
- ☐ High School
- ☐ Undergraduate
- ☐ Graduate
- ☐ Unknown

Race / ethnicity

- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Caucasian (English)
- ☐ Caucasian (French)
- ☐ Dutch
- ☐ Hispanic
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Unknown
- ☐ Other: _____

Geographical location

- ☐ Africa
- ☐ Asia
- ☐ Canada
- ☐ Europe
- ☐ U.S.A.
- ☐ Unknown
- ☐ Other: _____

Other Demographic Data

- ☐ Denomination
- ☐ Marital Status
- ☐ S.E.S.
- ☐ Other: _____

Sample selection

- ☐ Random selection
- ☐ Random assignment
- ☐ Population poll
- ☐ Purposeful selection
- ☐ Convenience sample
- ☐ Convenience w/ criteria

Methodology and Findings

God Concept - Type of Measure

- ❑ Adjective checklist
- ❑ Interview
- ❑ Projective technique
- ❑ Q-sort
- ❑ Semantic differential scale
- ❑ Questionnaire
- ❑ Likert scale
- ❑ Secondary data

God Concept - Emperical Instrument

- ❑ Clinical interview
- ❑ Ethnographic notes
- ❑ General Social Survey
- ❑ Gorsuch adjectives
- ❑ Loving & Controlling God
- ❑ Score-Dieu-Parent
- ❑ Spilka & Armatus Q-sort
- ❑ Self-developed scale

Self-developed scale based on:

- ❑ Gorsuch adjectives
- ❑ Spilka & Armatus Q-sort
- ❑ Other: _____

Self-developed scale: pilot study reported ..... ❑ Yes ❑ No

God Concept instrument information

- ❑ Construct validity
- ❑ Content validity
- ❑ Internal reliability
- ❑ Test-retest reliability

Descriptive Statistics reported ..... ❑ Mean ❑ S.D.

Independent variables

- ❑ Culture
- ❑ Demographics
- ❑ Education (field of study)
- ❑ Parental concept
- ❑ Parental preference
- ❑ Parental religious practice
- ❑ Parenting style
- ❑ Piagetian developmental stage
- ❑ Psychic structure
- ❑ Religious behavior
- ❑ Religious commitment
- ❑ Religious belief / attitude
- ❑ Religious instruction
- ❑ Self-concept
- ❑ Self-esteem
- ❑ Sexual abuse
- ❑ Other: _____

Data analysis techniques

- ❑ T-test
- ❑ Correlation
- ❑ Regression
- ❑ ANOVA
- ❑ Discriminant analysis
- ❑ Factor analysis
- ❑ Non-parametric
- ❑ Chi-square
- ❑ Frequency distribution
- ❑ Qualitiative

Further research recommended ..... ❑ Yes ❑ No

Findings _____

_____

_____

_____

_____